

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: John Kenneth BINGHAM et al.
Application No.: 10/509,568
Filed: 26 October 2005
For: A Method of Manufacture of an Automobile Structure Made by the Method
Examiner: Ryan J. WALTERS
Group Art Unit: 3726
Confirmation No. 9584

RESPONSE A – RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of September 2, 2009, Applicants submit the following response:

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are in the application and subject to a restriction requirement. According to the Examiner, the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A- Figures 1-4.

Species B- Figures 5-9.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect Species B (Figures 5-9) solely for the purpose of advancing the case, but such election is made with traverse. Claims 3, 16, 18-26, 34, and 36-38 are readable on Species B.

It is believed that the requirement to restrict the invention is improper. The species are sufficiently related that their respective classes would be thoroughly cross-referenced, and many of the same classes would be searched.

Furthermore, examination in separate applications will cause duplication of effort, particularly since it is believed that all of the same classes and subclasses would be searched. It is a more efficient use of Patent Office manpower and resources to examine all of the